

Fabian Horn

## Introduction: Space and Metaphor

### Summary

The introduction to the volume *Spatial Metaphors: Ancient Texts and Transformations* encompasses two sections: the first part, entitled “Preliminary Remarks on the Theory of Spatial Metaphors”, is aimed at providing a theoretical framework for the study of spatial metaphors by suggesting a classification according to specificity and extent. The approach underlying the typology is indebted to Lakoff and Johnson’s theory of conceptual metaphors (CMT). The second section offers short summaries of the individual contributions collected in this volume (not all of which draw on CMT) with particular regard to how the metaphors studied relate to the proposed framework. What becomes apparent is that even though formal classification of spatial metaphors is possible, philological study and interpretation of metaphors must always consider their respective contexts and work from the texts rather than from abstract theoretical conceptions of metaphor.

Keywords: Theory of metaphors; CMT; spatial metaphors; typology.

Die Einleitung des Tagungsbands *Spatial Metaphors: Ancient Texts and Transformations* umfasst zwei Abschnitte: Der erste Teil enthält vorbereitende Anmerkungen zur Metaphertheorie und versucht, durch die Klassifizierung anhand der Kriterien von Spezifität (*specificity*) und Umfang (*extent*) eine theoretische Struktur für die Untersuchung von Raummetaphern zu erarbeiten. Der Zugang, der dieser Typologie zugrundeliegt, steht in der Tradition der Theorie konzeptueller Metaphern von Lakoff und Johnson. Der zweite Abschnitt bietet eine kurze Übersicht und Zusammenfassung der einzelnen Beiträge des Bands (von denen nicht alle auf die Theorie konzeptueller Metaphern zurückgreifen) mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fragestellung, wie sich die untersuchten Metaphern zu der eingangs vorgestellten Struktur verhalten. Dabei wird deutlich, dass, obgleich die Möglichkeit einer formalen Klassifikation von Raummetaphern besteht, jede philologische Untersuchung und Interpretation immer die entsprechenden Kontexte miteinbeziehen muss und dabei nicht von abstrakten theoretischen Metaphermodellen, sondern den Texten selbst ihren Ausgang nehmen muss.

Keywords: Metaphertheorie; Theorie konzeptueller Metaphern; Raummetaphern; Typologie.

Fabian Horn, Cilliers Breytenbach (eds.) | *Spatial Metaphors. Ancient Texts and Transformations* | Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 39

(ISBN 978-3-9816384-2-4; URN urn:nbn:de:kobv:111-100237814) | [www.edition-topoi.de](http://www.edition-topoi.de)

## 1 Preliminary remarks on the theory of spatial metaphors

The studies presented in this volume discuss texts from a number of genres and languages ranging from wisdom texts and philosophical treatises to tragedy and from Ancient Egyptian to Shakespearean English (thus spanning almost 3000 years of human thought and language). Their common ground and the research objective of Topoi group C-2 *Space and Metaphor in Cognition, Language, and Texts* is the focus on the phenomenon of ‘spatial metaphor’.

For this approach, ‘space’ is taken in broad terms as any physical or non-physical place or location. Since further theoretical and philosophical refinement of the concept of ‘space’ would in all likelihood not be conducive to the purpose of linguistic and literary studies, we have rather opted for the concept of metaphor as the theoretical starting point. However, considering the substantial number of theoretical approaches to metaphor (not all of which are applicable to the interpretation and study of literary texts) and the staggering amount of publications concerning metaphor in the last decades,<sup>1</sup> a working definition for what is meant by the term ‘metaphor’ is first called for.

When it comes to metaphor and theories of metaphor, it is unavoidable for all studies from the field of ancient studies, and especially classical philology, to give pride of place to the general and well-known definition of Aristotle (384–322 BCE) who describes metaphor in his *Poetics* as the “transfer of a foreign name”.<sup>2</sup> Despite considerable advances with respect to the cognitive aspects of metaphor processing, contemporary research has not vastly progressed beyond this basic definition and metaphor is still primarily seen as a transfer of appellations; the only substantial modification or addition to Aristotle’s definition of metaphor as the “transfer of a foreign name” is that in contemporary theory metaphor is often not only viewed as ‘speaking about something in terms of something else’, but also as ‘thinking about something in terms of something else’.<sup>3</sup>

However, the terminology for describing and analyzing metaphor has been greatly refined: several theoreticians have stressed that a metaphor consists of two components, which in English are commonly referred to as ‘vehicle’ (the term or phrase which is used metaphorically in context) and ‘tenor’ (“the underlying idea of principal subject which

1 Cf. Rolf 2005, who distinguishes a total of 24 distinct theoretical approaches to metaphor.

2 Arist. *Po.* 21 [1457b6–7]: μεταφορά δέ ἐστιν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορά (...). Also cf. Weinrich 1976, 311: “Eine Metapher, und das ist im Grunde die einzig mögliche Metapherdefinition, ist ein Wort in einem Kontext, durch den es so determiniert wird, daß es etwas anderes meint, als es bedeutet.”

3 Cf. e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 36 et passim: “Metaphor is principally a way of conceiving of one thing in terms of another.” Similarly Semino 2008, 1: “By ‘metaphor’ I mean the phenomenon whereby we talk and, potentially, think about something in terms of something else.” For metaphor as a natural way of human thinking vide e.g. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Johnson 1987, Gibbs 1994, esp. 120–264, or Gibbs 1996.

the vehicle or figure means<sup>4</sup>), and only these two components together as a ‘double unit’ form a metaphor.<sup>5</sup> As another descriptive term, the common characteristics shared by the ‘tenor’ and the ‘vehicle’ which constitute the basis of the metaphorical transfer have been termed the ‘ground’ of the metaphor.<sup>6</sup>

A further important refinement of the definition of metaphor as transfer has been the specification that the transfer necessarily must involve two different ‘conceptual domains’<sup>7</sup> (a transfer within one and the same conceptual domain would more accurately have to be called a metonymy in modern terminology<sup>8</sup>). In this, the conceptual domain of the vehicle is called the ‘source domain,’ the domain of the tenor the ‘target domain,’<sup>9</sup> and as a result, individual metaphors can also be described as ‘cross-domain mappings.’ For cases where not only individual terms from distinct conceptual domains are transferred, but whole conceptual domains are correlated by means of metaphorical transfer, cognitive science has introduced the term ‘conceptual metaphor,’<sup>10</sup> and the resulting systematic conceptualization in both language and thought is referred to as a conceptual metaphor and expressed as *TARGET IS SOURCE*.<sup>11</sup> Ultimately, metaphor is much more than a mere stylistical or rhetorical device<sup>12</sup> and constitutes a fundamental principle of human thought, language, and cognition.

4 Definition quoted from Richards 1936, 97.

5 The terms ‘tenor’ and ‘vehicle’ were coined by Richards 1936, 96–97, who also deplores the imprecise use of the term ‘metaphor.’ This convenient terminology has largely been accepted by Anglo-phone researchers.

6 Cf. Richards 1936, 116–117.

7 Cf. the definitions in Evans 2007, 61–62 s. v. ‘domain (2)’ and Kövecses 2010, 323: “A conceptual domain is our conceptual representation, or knowledge, of any coherent segment of experience”.

8 The first two metaphorical transfer types described in Aristot. *Po.* 21 [1457b7–9], “from the genus to the species” (*totum pro parte*) and “from the species to the genus” (*pars pro toto*) are not treated as metaphors any more, but as metonymies or synecdoche (“quantitative metonymy”), also cf. Lausberg 1990, 295–297 §§572–573.

9 The terms ‘source domain’ and ‘target domain’ were introduced by Lakoff and Johnson 1980; the German scholar Harald Weinrich whose theoretical approach shares much common ground with the cognitive theory developed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) employed the terms ‘Bildspenderbereich’ and ‘Bildempfängerbereich,’ cf. Weinrich 1976.

10 For the cognitive theory of conceptual metaphors in general vide first Lakoff and Johnson 1980 and Lakoff 1993, for an overview over the established terminology of cognitive linguistics vide Evans 2007, esp. 33–35. A recent assessment of the theory can be found in Steen 2011. For criticism of this approach also vide the contribution of Schlesier (this volume). To make a clear terminological distinction, the term ‘linguistic’ or ‘textual’ metaphor denotes metaphors as they actually appear in spoken or written discourse as opposed to conceptual metaphors, i.e. the abstract metaphorical conceptualizations on which they are based.

11 We here follow the convention in cognitive linguistics to print conceptual metaphors (as opposed to individual linguistic metaphors) in small capitals to indicate that they do not appear as such in texts, but are deduced from individual textual occurrences of metaphorical language.

12 The classification of metaphor as a rhetorical device has a long tradition, e.g. in the pseudo-Ciceronian treatise *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.34.45 where metaphor appears as one of the ten *exornationes verborum*, in Cicero’s *De oratore* 3.41.165–170 in the context of rhetorical *ornatus*, in the *Orator* 27.92–94 as a stylistic device of transposition as well as in Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 8.6.4–8 as a rhetorical trope.

Within this theoretical framework, which is largely derived from cognitive linguistics and to some extent from early twentieth-century literary theory, spatial metaphor must be treated as a subset of metaphor. But as immediately becomes apparent from a glance at the individual studies compiled in this volume and their vastly different textual basis and subject matter, the deceptively simple single term ‘metaphor’ suggests a uniformity which does not do justice to the diverse material and the phenomena which can be treated under the heading of metaphor. Clearly, further differentiation and a typology of metaphors is called for in order to establish a theoretical framework for the classification of spatial metaphors.

The following typology of spatial metaphors, which was first devised by Topoi group C-2 for a joint publication,<sup>13</sup> is purely technical, and classifies metaphors according to the *specificity* of the spatial concept employed metaphorically (difference between types 1 and 2) and the *extent* of the metaphor (difference between types 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3). This schema does not take into consideration all the various possible functions of spatial metaphors, and the functionalization of spatial metaphors will be treated in detail in the individual studies of this volume; like all metaphors, as a matter of course, spatial metaphors may have an explicatory, didactic, persuasive, evaluative, etc. purpose and perhaps even encompass novelty of expression for a particular purpose. They may also, in some cases, serve no function in their respective context, particularly if they are conventional (entrenched, sometimes also called ‘dead’), and in these cases their use might not even be deliberate.<sup>14</sup>

1. The first type of spatial metaphor, identified by cognitive metaphor theory, has been called orientational.<sup>15</sup> The defining feature of orientational metaphors is the use of abstract spatial configurations (instead of specific locations or places), such as IN(SIDE) – OUT(SIDE), UP – DOWN, LEFT – RIGHT, or CENTER – PERIPHERY, to give spatial orientation or structure to a non-spatial concept. Often, two opposite spatial conceptualizations are correlated, such as in UP IS MORE and DOWN IS LESS, or RIGHT IS GOOD with the correlate LEFT IS BAD. However, this type of metaphor is often no longer recognized as a metaphor due to the conventionality of the underlying conceptualizations. Thus, orientational metaphors are very often non-deliberate and conventional, but sometimes available as a basis for new metaphorical expressions as well.

13 Horn et al. (in press).

14 For the use of the categories ‘conventional’ and ‘deliberate’ vide Steen 2008 and Steen 2011, esp. 38–43; contrary to earlier theories of metaphor, cognitive

metaphor theory holds that deliberate usage is not a requirement for the identification of metaphor.

15 On the theory of orientational metaphors cf. esp. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, 14–21, or Kövecses 2010, 40.

2. In contrast with this first type of orientational metaphors, which rely on abstract spatial relations and configurations, the next class of spatial metaphors utilizes more specific locations or places. Thus, metaphors belonging to this class can be spotted more easily, since they possess a higher degree of metaphoricity.<sup>16</sup> In the following classification, they will be arranged according to the cognitive extent of the metaphor, which may vary according to the text in which a particular metaphor occurs or to the author employing it.
- 2.1 The first, and most basic, type of this class of spatial metaphor is the use of a concrete or specific space or location on the lexical level when spatial characteristics are applied to a single word or phrase.<sup>17</sup> This occurs when a non-spatial term is referred to, or used, as if it were a place or space, or when one spatial term might be metaphorically conceived of in terms of another, different space or place.<sup>18</sup> These metaphors result from a simple transfer of vehicle to tenor without relating the whole conceptual domains from which they are taken through multiple mappings and are therefore isolated, i.e. non-conceptual.<sup>19</sup>
- 2.2 A second, and more extensive, type of spatial metaphor is the use of a specific space or location on the conceptual level. While the conceptual metaphor must still be instantiated on the lexical level of individual linguistic metaphors, it is not a single word, but a whole concept which is given spatial properties by means of metaphoric transfer. This happens when a spatial metaphor on the lexical level can be regarded as a mapping of a more extensive underlying conceptualization. In the case of this second type of spatial metaphor, it is insufficient to view tenor and vehicle as isolated lexical entities, but they have to be regarded as parts of their respective domains.<sup>20</sup>

16 For a theoretical approach to distinguishing varying degrees of 'metaphoricity', i.e. the degree to which an individual textual metaphor is regarded as metaphorical by a recipient (as opposed to applying the obsolete 'dead' – 'alive' distinction, which was already criticized by Richards 1936, 101–102) see Hanks 2006 or Müller 2008, esp. 178–209; Müller defines metaphoricity as a continuum starting with expressions whose original metaphorical character is entirely obscured by semantic opacity and poetic novel metaphors with high metaphoricity forming the other end of the spectrum.

17 For an attempt to define and analyze metaphor on the lexical level through the difference between basic and contextual meaning see Pragglejaz Group, esp. 3, also summarized in Semino 2008, 11–12, further developed in Steen et al. 2010, esp. 1–42.

18 In the third conceivable case of a spatial term being denoted by a non-spatial term we would not call the result of the transfer a spatial metaphor.

19 In cognitive metaphor theory, the terms 'image metaphor' or 'one-shot metaphor' are occasionally employed to denote this type of isolated mapping, cf. Lakoff and Turner 1989, 89–96, Lakoff 1993, 229–231, and the definition in Kövecses 2010, 327: "One-shot image metaphors involve the superimposition of one rich image onto another rich image. [...] These cases are called 'one-shot' metaphors because, in them, we bring into correspondence two rich images for a temporary purpose on a particular occasion."

20 For the theoretical basis of interpreting metaphors as cross-domain mappings see the fundamental works of the cognitive linguistic theory of conceptual metaphors, esp. Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Lakoff and Turner 1989; Lakoff 1993. A recent assessment of the theory can be found in Steen 2011.

Thus, this type of metaphor entails multiple transfers, i.e. mappings, which form conceptual metaphors with a spatial source domain being correlated with a target domain.<sup>21</sup> For such mappings to qualify for the category of spatial conceptual metaphor, the source domain must be spatial while the target domain may, but need not, be a spatial concept.

- 2.3 The most extensive type of spatial metaphor can be found in cases where a specific space or location is used metaphorically on a broader textual level. It is possible for a longer narration or even a whole text to function as a spatial metaphor (something like a macro-metaphor). Assuming the traditional definition of allegory as ‘extended metaphor’,<sup>22</sup> this type could also amount to and be described as spatial allegory.

The typology proposed above has been developed with a view to spatial metaphors, but other classifications and distinctions of metaphors are also applicable and may be important for the appropriate interpretation of any individual metaphor. Further categories, which can be applied to any metaphor and ultimately contribute to forming a “three-dimensional model” of metaphor<sup>23</sup> are the distinctions between ‘deliberate’ or ‘non-deliberate’ usage of a particular metaphor and the appraisal of a metaphor’s linguistic form as ‘conventional’ or ‘novel’. The latter distinction is very important for the interpretation and the literary value of metaphors; however, the distinction between ‘conventional’ and ‘novel’ suggest a polar contrast which may be misleading: the ‘conventionality’ or ‘novelty’, in other words, the ‘metaphoricity’ of a metaphor is not an absolute category, but rather a matter of degree which always depends on the context.<sup>24</sup> Combining these two categories results in the following cognitive linguistic framework for metaphors (cf. Table 1):

With regard to literary studies and interpretations, deliberate metaphors, both conventional and novel, and their functions in context are of particular importance and have been the focus of research.<sup>25</sup> From a linguistic and anthropological point of view, the value of the study of non-deliberate metaphors consists in their potential to shed

21 The use of several metaphorical expressions from one target domain referring to the same source domain has been described as ‘extension’ by Semino 2008, 25–26. However, for this type of conceptual metaphor to be present in a text it is not necessary that extension occurs; if a lexical metaphor is isolated, but evokes the metaphorical equation of two domains, it is already possible to speak of a conceptual metaphor.

22 Cf. Quintilian’s *metaphora continua* (*Institutio oratoria* 8.6.44–53). On the possibility of the ‘extension’ of metaphor cf. again Semino 2008, 25–26. Note, however, that a further distinction could be made

between an extended metaphor which occurs only in a passage of text and an allegory encompassing the text as a whole.

23 Cf. Steen 2008 and Steen 2011, esp. 38–43.

24 On the context sensitivity of metaphors see e.g. Stern 2000. Also vide Black 1955 for the distinction between the metaphorical utterance, which he calls the ‘focus’ of the metaphor, and the surrounding non-metaphorical context, the ‘frame’.

25 On theoretical attempts to generalize about the functions of metaphor cf. e.g. Silk 2003, 126–131 or Goatly 2011, 153–177.

	conventional	novel
non-deliberate	traditionally referred to as ‘dead metaphors’ (often not treated as metaphorical, even though this class likely constitutes the bulk of metaphors in spoken and written discourse)	(unlikely)
deliberate	common, with several different functions, such as didactic, mnemonic, informative, persuasive, divertive etc. purposes	poetic, also with specific functions

Tab. 1 Linguistical framework for metaphors.

light on how different cultures at various points in their history think and speak about abstract concepts and thus to contribute to the understanding of the ‘mental infrastructure’<sup>26</sup> of a speech community, since all languages have their own conceptualizations and metaphors.<sup>27</sup>

## 2 Contributors and contributions to this volume

The initially proposed theoretical framework for classifying spatial metaphors shows that the metaphorical use of spaces and spatiality can occur to a varying extent and on all levels of literary discourse. The studies presented in this volume illustrate the scope and potential of the analysis of spatial metaphors through a number of genres and languages, ranging from wisdom texts and philosophical treatises to tragedy, and from Ancient Egyptian to Shakespearean English (thus spanning almost 3000 years of human thought and language). Most of the contributions are indebted to conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) and the cognitive linguistic approach to metaphors, but some explore the boundaries and limitations of CMT, present alternatives, or draw on other theories

26 The term ‘mental infrastructure’ (German ‘mentale Infrastruktur’) was coined by the German ancient historian Christian Meier in several publications and in a broad sense denotes the knowledge which is essential to find one’s way in the world; more precisely, in case of metaphors it denotes the cognitive structures which facilitate the coherent interpretation of experience and the construction of abstract meaning in language.

27 The question of cross-cultural metaphorical universals is discussed e.g. in Kövecses 2005 and Dan-cygier and Sweetser 2014, 162–182 with the result that there are few, if any, absolute metaphorical conceptualizations.

of metaphor (esp. Schlesier, Utzschneider, Lobsien). In the diversity of its studies, this volume – the first to ever address spatial metaphors comprehensively in literary studies – offers an example of the possibilities and philological potential of applying different theoretical approaches to metaphor to different genres and texts.

In a general sense, the contributions collectively substantiate the initial claim that spatial metaphors are a universal principle of human cognition. Somewhat more specifically, they show that the practice of attributing specific spatial relations to non-spatial or less clearly structured spatial concepts is in tune with the general tendency of the human mind to employ metaphorical thinking and phrasing when coping with abstract and ‘difficult’ concepts.<sup>28</sup> The resulting metaphors are complex and frequently influential, developing a momentum and occasionally a history of their own.<sup>29</sup> The following overview is an attempt to apply the typology and classifications developed above to the individual studies of spatial metaphors in texts collected in this volume which all investigate into metaphors and their interpretations from a literary point of view.

The first article in this volume, Wolfgang Raible’s (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg) “Metaphors as Models of Thinking”, follows a theoretical semantic approach not based on any particular text or text corpus and shows how our cognitive ability to interpret the world around us is largely based on metaphor and metonymy which let us see relations based on similarity and contiguity between different concepts. By various examples ranging from biblical interpretation to the world of science and technology, the pervasiveness and importance of these models of thinking is demonstrated.

The first of the following series of case studies, “Spatial Metaphors as Rhetorical Figures. Case Studies from Wisdom Texts of the Egyptian New Kingdom” by Camilla Di Biase-Dyson (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen) is dedicated to the study of deliberate spatial metaphors and their didactic and persuasive functions in Egyptian wisdom texts. The focus of her paper lies in the development of the path metaphor in particular, both in and across texts, to show its role in shaping the wisdom genre.

In her article “KRATER. The Mixing-Vessel as Metaphorical Space in Ancient Greek Tradition”, Renate Schlesier (Freie Universität Berlin) confronts Aristotle’s concept of metaphor as a transfer presupposing a comparison or an analogy between two material or mental elements with examples drawn from ancient Greek poetry (Homer, Sappho, the *Anacreontea*). It is demonstrated that concepts such as Aristotle’s and CMT, which also draws on Aristotle’s theory of comparison, are unable to convey the poetic impact of the semantic mixtures between those elements.

28 Cf. esp. Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Johnson 1987, Gibbs 1994, 120–264, and Gibbs 1996.

29 The ‘interaction theory’ developed in Black 1955, 285–291 is an attempt to account for the fact that the combination of two conceptual domains, or

frames of reference, through metaphor can develop a momentum of its own and give rise to associations which reach beyond mere comparison, also cf. function (c) of the schema of functions in Silk 2003, 126.



Fabian Horn's (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) contribution is entitled "Metaphor and Spatial Conceptualization: Observations on Orientational Metaphors in Lycophron's *Alexandra*" and deals with conceptual orientational metaphors in Ancient Greek. This type of metaphor is often neglected in philological studies, since it is usually conventional and often also non-deliberate (and thus likely has no particular literary function in most contexts). However, the article aims to demonstrate that non-deliberate metaphors and their underlying conceptualizations still have the potential to shed light on the cognitive structures which facilitate the coherent interpretation of experience and the construction of abstract meaning in language.

The next two contributions, Markus Egg's (Humboldt-Universität Berlin) "Spatial Metaphor in the Pauline Epistles" and Cilliers Breytenbach's (Humboldt-Universität Berlin) "Taufe als räumliche Metapher?," are both concerned with the copious orientational and more specific spatial metaphors in the Letters of Paul and their functions as instruments of cognition. Drawing on ideas developed by the Russian formalist Viktor Schklowski, Markus Egg's analysis of Pauline metaphors puts their innovative power down to alienation: rather than facilitating the understanding of complex or novel concepts, Paul's metaphors foreground the limitations of metaphorical expressions. This literary strategy is characteristic for poetic discourse but unusual for didactic and persuasive texts like epistles. Similarly, Cilliers Breytenbach's interpretation of Paul's conception of baptism as a spatial metaphor establishes this particular metaphor as part of Paul's macro-metaphor "being in Christ." Thus, both studies point to the conclusion that Paul's metaphors are deliberate, conceptual, and essential for his theology.

Helmut Utzschneider's (Augustana-Hochschule Neuendettelsau) article "Irdisches Himmelreich. Die 'Stiftshütte' (Ex 25–40\*) als theologische Metapher" examines the metaphorical character of a narrative from the Hebrew Bible and discusses the theological implications of the deliberately metaphorical conceptualization of the dwelling of God. His analysis draws on the work of Paul Ricoeur and Hans Blumenberg and thus presents an alternative approach to CMT.

In his essay "For to Have Fallen Is Not a Grievous Thing, but to Remain Prostrate after Falling, and Not to Get up Again: The Persuasive Force of Spatial Metaphors in Chrysostom's Exhortation to Theodore," Jan Stenger (University of Glasgow) studies the usage of spatial metaphors as a cognitive mechanism and as instruments of persuasion with epistemic and paraenetic functions in a treatise of the Church Father John Chrysostom. The metaphors treated in this context are adapted to the communicative aims and employ both abstract spatial configurations and specific locations or places. Furthermore, Stenger's contribution also pays attention to the audience's response to Chrysostom's metaphors and discusses the involvement of the readers and how spatial imagery can elicit a response from them.

The contribution “Räume der Erkenntnis. Zur Funktion der Raummetaphorik in Augustins Epistemologie” by Therese Fuhrer (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) studies the use of conceptual spatial metaphors and their importance as a cognitive device in the writings of Augustine. The essay explores how Augustine uses orientational metaphors and more specific spatial metaphors to conceptualize and represent both the human mind and the divine trinity.

Beatrice Trînca’s (Freie Universität Berlin) article “Brandans Buch der Welt. Eine konkretisierte Metapher” focuses on the literary potential of a religious metaphor, Augustine’s metaphor of the world as a book, which becomes concrete in several episodes of the medieval travelogue *Sankt Brandans Reise*. Even though the metaphor may be conventional, insofar as it can be traced back to a source from Late Antiquity, its deliberate usage as a concrete metaphor in medieval literature puts it to novel use and explores the boundaries and limitations of the concept of metaphor.

Verena Olejniczak Lobsien’s (Humboldt-Universität Berlin) contribution “In Other Words: George Herbert’s Metaphorical Textures” shows how the complex metaphors referred to as *conchetto* or conceit in the poetry of the seventeenth-century metaphysical poet George Herbert explore the boundaries of conceptual metaphor and the possibilities of presenting the unrepresentable through allegorical references.

The focus on spatial metaphors, which are associated with certain formal characteristics, is the common feature of all these individual studies. But beyond formal classifications of their metaphors, a main target of literary analysis of metaphors is their elaboration and function in context. Even a tentative overview of this kind may serve to demonstrate the limits of attempting to generalize about form and usage of spatial metaphors in the light of the almost unfathomable diversity of metaphors. Ultimately, all philological study and interpretation of metaphors must always consider their respective functional and compositional contexts and work from the textual basis rather than from pre-existing conceptions of metaphor.

# Bibliography

## Black 1955

Max Black. "Metaphor". *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 55 (1955), 273–294.

## Dancygier and Sweetser 2014

Barbara Dancygier and Eve Sweetser. *Figurative Language*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

## Evans 2007

Vyvyan Evans. *A Glossary of Cognitive Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

## Gibbs 1994

Raymond W. Gibbs Jr. *The Poetics of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

## Gibbs 1996

Raymond W. Gibbs Jr. "Why Many Concepts are Metaphorical". *Cognition* 61 (1996), 309–319.

## Goatly 2011

Andrew Goatly. *The Language of Metaphors*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011.

## Hanks 2006

P. Hanks. "Metaphoricity is Gradable". In *Corpus-Based Approaches to Metaphor and Metonymy*. Ed. by A. Stefanowitsch and S. Th. Gries. Trends in Linguistics 171. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2006, 17–35.

## Horn et al. (in press)

Fabian Horn, Cilliers Breytenbach, Camilla Di Biase-Dyson, Markus Egg, Therese Fuhrer, Verena Lobsien, Renate Schlesier, Jan Stenger, and Beatrice Trınca. "Spatial Metaphors of the Ancient World: Theory and Practice". In *Excellence Cluster Topoi – Research Group Papers*. Hrsg. von G. Graßhoff und M. Meyer. eTopoi Special Volume 6, in press.

## Johnson 1987

Mark Johnson. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

## Kövecses 2005

Zoltán Kövecses. *Metaphor in Culture. Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

## Kövecses 2010

Zoltán Kövecses. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

## Lakoff 1993

George Lakoff. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. by A. Ortony. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 202–251.

## Lakoff and Johnson 1980

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

## Lakoff and Turner 1989

George Lakoff and Mark Turner. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

## Lausberg 1990

Heinrich Lausberg. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990.

## Müller 2008

Cornelia Müller. *Metaphors Dead and Alive, Sleeping and Waking. A Dynamic View*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

## Pragglejaz Group

Pragglejaz Group (Peter Crisp, Raymond Gibbs, Alice Deignan, Graham Low, Gerard Steen, Lynne Cameron, Elena Semino, Joe Grady, Alan Cienki, and Zoltán Kövecses). "MIP: A Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse". *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (2007), 1–39.

## Richards 1936

Ivor Armstrong Richards. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

**Rolf 2005**

Eckhard Rolf. *Metaphertheorien. Typologie – Darstellung – Bibliographie*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2005.

**Semino 2008**

Elena Semino. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

**Silk 2003**

Michael Silk. "Metaphor and Metonymy: Aristotle, Jacobson, Ricoeur, and Other". In *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition. Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions*. Ed. by G. R. Boys-Stones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, 115–147.

**Steen 2008**

Gerard J. Steen. "The Paradox of Metaphor: Why We Need a Three-Dimensional Model of Metaphor". *Metaphor and Symbol* 23 (2008), 213–241.

**Steen 2011**

Gerard J. Steen. "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor – Now New and Improved!" *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (2011), 26–64.

**Steen et al. 2010**

Gerard J. Steen, Aletta G. Dorst, J. Berenike Herrmann, Anna A. Kaal, Tina Krennmayr, and Trijntje Pasma. *A Method for Linguistic Metaphor Identification: From MIP to MIPVU*. Converging Evidence in Language and Communication 14. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010.

**Stern 2000**

Josef Stern. *Metaphor in Context*. Cambridge, Ma. and London: MIT Press, 2000.

**Weinrich 1976**

Harald Weinrich. *Sprache in Texten*. Stuttgart: Klett, 1976.

**Table credits**

1 Fabian Horn.

**FABIAN HORN**

Fabian Horn, Dr. phil (München 2013), was Post-doctoral Research Fellow of the Topoi research group C-2 *Space and Metaphor in Cognition, Language, and Texts* with a project about metaphors in the *Alexandra* of Lycophron in 2013/14 and currently works at the Department of Classics at the University of Munich. His research interests are theories of metaphor and their application to Archaic and Classical Greek literature, with particular focus on the Homeric poems.

Dr. Fabian Horn

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Abteilung für Griechische und Lateinische

Philologie

Schellingstraße 3 (VG)

80799 München, Germany

E-Mail: Fabian.Horn@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de